

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and in view of the following comments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application, and claims 1, 2 and 7-14 are amended by the present amendment.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 2 and 7-9 and indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. These claims have been so rewritten and it is submitted that these claims are now allowable. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 4-6 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as unpatentable over US patent number 6,298,173 B1 to Lopresti. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a data storage device in which a reduction unit reduces data in each of a plurality of files, the reducing including at least one of file deletion, data compaction, document summarization, and file saving. Independent claims 10-14 include similar features, support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 5, lines 19-21. Moreover, Lopresti does not teach or suggest these features.

In a non-limiting example, the data storage device of claim 1 includes a variety of data-amount reduction methods. Therefore, the device of claim 1 is able to process files of a large variety of file types, and the device is less dependent on file type with regard to its method of reducing the associated amount of data, and the amount of data generally is reduced to a greater extent than the system of Lopresti.

In contrast, Lopresti merely discusses a document image database in which a document is represented by a digital data file which is divided into a number of regions. The regions are respectively modified by storage reduction means according to storage preference rules. The file portions corresponding to the regions are reduced with respect only to storage size, and then the regions are converted into reduction data files and stored in a database system.

Accordingly, Lopresti only discusses reducing the size of data files stored in a database in a manner determined by pre-arranged settings associated with processing methods employed specifically for document image processing. Lopresti does not teach or suggest reducing data in files including at least one of file deletion, data compaction, document summarization, and file saving, as in the independent claims (see claim well as 10-14). It is respectfully submitted the

independent claims and each of the claims depending there from patentably distinguish over Lopresti.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lopresti in view of US patent number 5,276,867 to Kenley. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1, which as discussed above is believed to patentably distinguish over Lopresti. Further, Kenley only discusses a digital data storage apparatus that moves selected data files from a primary store to a backing store based on a quantity of data exceeding a threshold amount, and also does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1/23/4

By: \_\_\_\_\_



J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 454-1589  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501